To: Mr. Dean Allison – MP Niagara West

Date: 1/28/2022

From: The Town of Grimsby

Subject: Grimsby Regional Airport

Dear Mr. Allison,

Please find this communication on behalf of the Town of Grimsby and Tax Payer constituents who reside in the area of the Grimsby air park.

As you are aware, the changes with respect to the operation of this formerly small and lightly used air park have presented us with challenges that we strongly feel need to be addressed.

We appreciate the time that you and your office have provided us in our resolution efforts back in October 2021. Please know that we as a Group have responded in a good faith manner hoping that the outcome of that meeting would translate into something positive. Please know that more than six months have passed and nothing positive has resulted from your efforts. In fact we have reason to believe that things will actually get worse as we head into the spring and summer months.

As a result, we are hopeful that you can, as we discussed six+ months ago, reach out to the Minister of Transport Canada on our behalf. We have provided a draft letter for that purpose for your convenience. Any recommendations you have with respect to changes to this letter are welcome. Additionally, we have supplied a document entitled "Grimsby air park – Background, Issues and Recommendations". Contained within it is some historical context, discussion on current policy and recommendations we believe are reasonable and fair to all those affected.

In short as you are aware, our concerns include but are not limited to:

1) Our Rights to Safety, Enjoyment of Property and Privacy that are currently being compromised.

2) How Our Rights to Equal Treatment under the laws and policy of the Federal government have been disregarded.

3) The impact that the continued operation of this air park in this manner will have on our ability to grow this part of our town in the longer term.

With respect to points 1 and 2, we have reason to believe not that anyone has approached us or that these restrictions are present on our property deeds that we are no longer allowed to enjoy our properties as others can. We apparently are no longer allowed to do things like light fires, fly kites or fly drones because of the imposition of this PRIVATELY owned and RECREATIONAL air park.

Again we appreciate your time and support in this matter and are hopeful that we can continue the dialogue necessary to see this matter resolved satisfactorily.

Kindest Regards,

The Town of Grimsby and its' Tax Payers.

To: The Minister of Transport Canada, Mr. Omar Alghabra

Date:

From: MP – Niagara West, Mr. Dean Allison on behalf of the Towns of Grimsby and West Lincoln and a Growing Group of Tax Payers

Subject: Issues with PRIVATELY owned and operated Grimsby air park, Current air park Regulations and Interjurisdictional Immunity

Dear Minister Alghabra,

Please find the attached discussion and recommendations. It outlines the issues that currently exist between a PRIVATELY owned and operated air park (Grimsby Regional air park), numerous Tax Paying citizens in the area of the air park and the Town of Grimsby.

It also discusses possible resolutions that we as a Group hope will be considered. There is much more to this than recorded, however we respect your time, so we have tried to keep this communication as brief and concise as possible.

We are hopeful that upon review of this information that you recognize:

1) Our Rights to Safety, Enjoyment of Property and Privacy that are currently being compromised.

2) Our Rights to Equal Treatment under the laws and policy of the Federal government have been disregarded.

3) The negative impact that the continued operation of this air park in this manner will have on our ability to grow this part of our town in the longer term.

4) That this air park is abusing the privilege bestowed upon it (Interjurisdictional Immunity) in a manner that does a disservice to those many air parks that contribute positively to their immediate communities.

With respect to points 1 and 2, we have reason to believe, not that anyone has approached us or that these restrictions are present on our property deeds, that we are no longer allowed to enjoy our properties as others can. We apparently are no longer allowed to do things like light fires, fly kites or fly drones because of the imposition of this PRIVATELY owned and RECREATIONAL air park.

We look forward to further discussion of this at your earliest convenience and trust you will advise Mr. Dean Allison, our MP of West Niagara, accordingly.

Of course feel free to contact me directly.

On behalf of a growing list of concerned Tax Paying property owners, thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Greg Middeton,

Grimsby air park – Historical Context, Existing Policy and Recommendations

# **Historical Context**

The Grimsby air park used to be a privately owned and operated personal hobbyist operation. Many years ago, it had a modest training facility that failed as a business.

Air traffic was largely minimal and most pilots were respectful of our rights to safety, enjoyment of property and privacy. They largely kept out over the fields. Despite the air park organizing in 1978, there were many homes and livestock operations in the vicinity prior to that. This air park was only tolerated because of the minimal amount of traffic it presented. Prior to the year 2000 landing/take-off events were only a few per week. Between the years 2000 and 2015, prior to new ownership, the number of landing/take-off events were approximately a modest 520 per year or 10 per week.

# Fast forward to the Present.....

This air park has now been sold to a company that among other things, is now operating a flight school out of that location. As a result, we have been faced with significantly increased traffic, some of which are flying as low as SEVENTY FIVE feet over our homes depending on how close one is located to the airport. Even kilometres away they pass over our homes in some cases as low as ONE HUNDRED feet. Late night/Early morning activity is not uncommon. Imagine a plane barnstorming your home at 100' at 6am or planes passing over your lifelong home every 4-5 minutes for hours at a time! Sometimes they are so loud you have to stop talking, they rattle windows, you can hear them in basements or with ear protection on.

The Grimsby air park exists on roughly 100 acres compared to the 300+ acres the Niagara District Airport occupies that offers these very same services. Twenty minutes away, the Dorothy Rungeling Airport in Welland Ontario resides on 400+ acres. At approximately 100 acres The Grimsby air park was never intended to be anything more than a small personal air park. The new operation represents a *change in use* that area residents do not support and that is resulting in damages. On some days we are dealing with over a 100 landing/take-off events.

# It is important to note that .....

It should also be noted that, with respect to land use for an air park, this property fails in many regards in ways that puts pilots and those on the ground in harms way. Wildlife refuges, ponds, open fields, parks, cattle paddocks, poultry factory farms, hog farms and landfills all exist within Primary, Secondary and Special Zones per TP1247 PART 3. The level of risk ranges from POTENTIALLY HIGH to POTENTIALLY MODERATE. This represents more risk than the local residents are prepared to accept for this largely *RECREATIONAL* activity. These concerns were not as prevalent beforehand due to the low number of flights, however now this is not the case. Bird collisions have been witnessed. Wild life such as deer crossing the runway has also been observed.

There is virtually no security on this site. There is no perimeter fencing and security lighting.

We have eye witness accounts of middle in the night flights arriving without runway and airplane lighting activated. They land for a couple of minutes, a car will exit the air park rapidly and the plane takes off again. The concern here is that this facility, due to lacking security, is engaged in illegal activity.

Additionally, it would appear that this PRIVATELY owned air park is taking advantage of the Interjurisdictional Immunity it enjoys in a manner that was never the original intent of this privilege.

a) On at least one occasion events like unsanctioned and unsafe drag racing have been held on this site. They involved large groups, had no security or first responder support. Police were called and the organizers cited federal Interjurisdictional immunity preventing law enforcement from enforcing the laws we all live by. b) Please know that we also have reason to believe that the original intent of the re-classification of this property from RURAL to UTILITY by the previous owner was in order to execute a sale to Durante Properties. Durante Properties shortly after taking control of this property, took the Town of Grimsby to the Land Tribunal over its use of the property as a works yard. The Town of Grimsby lost on appeal in 2020. This has resulted in a situation where a private company is using and abusing its Interjurisdictional Immunity privileges to avoid scrutiny of its activity on this property.

#### As a Community we have tried to deal with this Air Park in a constructive manner.....

In early 2021 a noise committee was established that included a Grimsby councillor (Dorothy Bothwell) and the Mayor of West Lincoln (Dave Bylsma). This committee only met once. It was reported that recommendations were drafted. Despite inquiries, we were never apprised of these recommendations. Despite numerous complaints from many affected property owners we never received a response from air park management.

In the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of calendar year 2021, out of frustration and at the request of our TAX PAYER GROUP, a meeting was called by our MP Dean Allison, Mayors of West Lincoln and Grimsby and our MPP Sam Oosterhoff with air park management. As a result of this meeting, in October 2021, it was reported by the air park that they would re-engage the noise committee, implement a 1000' rule (pilots to attain 1000' before banking or entering descent at 1000') and make the air park PPR (Prior Permission Required). In the interest of being reasonable, despite reservations, we as a Group decided to give this a chance.

Unfortunately none of the above responses resulted in any improvement. The outcome of this as of the 1st week of January 2022, a full YEAR after the initial engagement and six months after the multi-governmental meeting with the Grimsby air park, has been:

a) No decrease in flight activity. On those days nice enough to fly during these winter months, planes continued to repeatedly passed over our homes and properties at unsafe altitudes. Please see a sample of flight activity at the bottom of this document. Please know that very recently and largely due to the increase in fuel prices, flight activity has lessened. We are only mentioning this here in the interest of being open and honest. However, we are concerned that once fuel prices return to something more normal, that activity will return to its previous levels.

b) Planes disregarding the 1000' rule and our homes continuing to be barnstormed.

c) Emails to the air park going unanswered.

d) The noise committee not re-initiated as promised.

e) On at least one occasion meetings were cancelled without notice. One involved Mayor Bylsma.

The bulk of the offensive activity is related to flight training. Air park property management knew this was the case when offering to make the air park PPR (Prior Permission Required). The air park claimed it was pilots from other air parks causing the problems. It was the very pilots/trainers that operated out of this air park.

On one occasion one member of our Group was finally able to get a response from the air park and was offered an "if you don't like it move" ultimatum by the manager Gary Plummer.

Naturally, we are all very concerned what this will mean when the weather gets nicer. Especially if the attitude expressed above prevails.

#### In summary, our concerns are related to ....

a) Our <u>*Rights to safety, enjoyment of property and privacy*</u> continue to be stripped away by a PRIVATELY owned recreational company and pilots that continue to fly their planes over our properties at altitudes that according to current CARAC policy would be considered unsafe elsewhere.

b) Our <u>*Rights to Fair and Equal Treatment under the law*</u> and the fact that we are not offered the same protections afforded to property owners who reside farther away from this air park under the current policy. We have reason to believe that this issue, satisfying Charter compliance case predicates, is actionable.

Again this PRIVATE enterprise offers zero economic value to the community, is not owned by any level of government and is not of national interest. It is simply a facility that allows recreational pilots a place to execute and learn their hobby at our collective expense.

We are not aware of any other recreational activity that is allowed to impose itself in this manner on Tax Paying property owners as is the case here. Please know that there are other facilities available that offer these services that are more ideally suited for this activity in the Region.

Please know that in close proximity to this air park, West Lincoln has developed a hamlet which is slated for additional growth. Grimsby has established a hamlet along Grimsby Mountain Road that is also affected by this traffic. That is in addition to all of the homes and farming/livestock operations that have existed in the area, many of which were present before the air park was first licensed, on a much smaller scale, to operate on this location. The Town of Grimsby has also made significant investment in its recreational property Southward Community Park just down the road. This park falls into the Secondary Hazard Zone per TP1247 Part 3.

The negative impact this has had on numerous residents has been widespread ranging from PTSD like symptoms, lost sleep, severe anxiety, loss of enjoyment and of course concern that at any time one of these planes could fail and a crash occur. One person has already been injured from an aircraft crash originating from this air park.

Several months ago, a plane that was destined for the Grimsby air park for circuit training purposes crash landed on the 407. We have witnessed bird strikes and close calls that we know go unreported. Again, please review the impact statements to get a sense of our frustration and concern.

This is a photo of a plane that crashed a couple of 100 yards from Ruby Wilcox's former lifetime residence on Kemp Road, Grimsby.



The plane pictured below crash landed on the 407 just a couple of months ago. Thankfully, no innocents were hurt. It was on its way to Grimsby air park where it was scheduled to continuously fly for hours over our homes/properties at altitudes that would be considered unsafe elsewhere. All this for a recreational hobby! I know my hobbies don't put people at risk in their homes.



# A Few Points on Current Regulatory Policy

For your convenience, please find these brief notes on current policy and how they contribute to this situation.

# **1)** Minimum Flight Altitudes:

Currently rules are in place restricting flight altitudes/clearance of 1000' (linearly/laterally) over built up areas (houses, buildings, persons present) or 500' in areas that are not built up (expansive fields, undeveloped terrain). We understand that this policy was designed to allow the pilot an opportunity to recover and avoid personal property in the event of a bird strike, malfunction, health issue or any other mishap that can occur. This policy makes sense.

The following is what does not make sense. Exempt from the above rules are the take-off and landing phases of flight. Please note that landing and take-off phases of flight are, for reasons that should be obvious, statistically the highest risk phases of flight.

Every time a plane barnstorms our homes/properties and Transport Canada investigates they use this exemption to justify this behaviour. The response from Transport Canada has traditionally been that as long as the pilot is landing or taking off they can fly at whatever altitude they want, wherever they want!

#### We hope you are asking yourself the following questions:

# a) Why would government policy allow for a pilot to fly/land/take-off over a PRIVATE Home/Property that is not controlled/owned by the air park at altitudes that are otherwise restricted over other properties for reasons of SAFETY?

b) How is it possible that one CANADIAN Tax Payer is afforded protections under the law and another afforded NOTHING under the very same policy document?

# 2) Interjurisdictional Immunity

Air parks enjoy what is called Interjurisdictional Immunity. Interjurisdictional Immunity prevents the province, municipality and region from enforcing laws and policies on air parks such as this even if they are PRIVATE enterprises and of zero national interest.

This immunity extends to building, land change/use, noise etc. It would appear that once a property is licensed as an air park, even if it is PRIVATELY owned and of no significance whatsoever, that regional, provincial and municipal authorities have little recourse in terms of enforcement of their respective laws on those properties.

This has caused other municipalities much grief and material legal costs. Take Burlington Airport for example and its landfill disposal efforts. This was all done in the name of expansion which never occurred. It was largely accepted that the tipping fees, which were almost a million dollars, were the real reason behind that activity. The end result for the city of Burlington was expending hundreds of thousands of dollars in legal fees and significant hardship on local property Tax Payers. This occurred only because of the immunity that is for some reason afforded to these private businesses by the Federal government and subsequent abuse by the property owner. We are hopeful that you are seeing the disconnect here.

As mentioned previously, we have reason to believe that Durante Properties is primarily interested in this property for private non-aviation related activities. However, it wants to keep the aviation element of the property active so that it can enjoy the Interjurisdictional Immunity that is attached to it.

# Our Recommendations and Request for Change

It's always easy to complain, so we have given some thought to what we consider to be practical solutions to these problems. As the Legal property owners of the lands in question, we feel that they are appropriate and respect our Rights to Fair and Equal treatment under Federal Laws and Government policy as they pertain to our Rights to Safety, Enjoyment of Property and Privacy.

# 1) Control of Land Required to Facilitate 1000' Altitude

Privately owned for-profit air parks that are of zero national interest should be required to either acquire through lease or ownership the land necessary to accommodate a pre-landing/post-take-off phase of flight altitude/clearance of 1000' (linearly/laterally).

This policy change would introduce consistency within the measures currently employed to protect the general population. All CANADIANS are afforded equal treatment under the rule of law. Government policies can not discriminate. In this particular case we as a Group do not have the same protections afforded other CANADIAN Tax Payers. Canadians other than us are afforded visa vis government policy a minimum flight clearance of 1000' over their personal properties. For some reason, Tax Paying property owners in the vicinity of air parks (even if they are kilometres away/regardless of who was there first) are not afforded these very same protections. This is a Charter issue.

If this policy change were implemented, many of our issues would be resolved. It would provide a mechanism whereby if neighbours accepted the risks a facility of this nature could co-exist. It would also provide for the implementation of understandings that would be enforceable. It would recognize that area property owners have rights that deserve to be respected.

Frankly, we do not understand how this allowance to fly/land/take-off over someone else's personal property during the most dangerous phases of flight ever came into existence. However, that doesn't mean it can't or shouldn't be corrected. We use the term correction, because it is our opinion that this policy should never have been introduced in the first place and that when this policy was originally developed area property owners were not considered in the process. We are pretty certain the only people that had input were pilots and they were simply securing their own interests at our expense. As it stands right now our properties are being used as extensions of this air park to the benefit of the for-profit private largely recreational enterprises that operate out of them.

We understand that federally owned airports that are of national interest like Pearson International, would be exempt for obvious reasons.

Many of us on this list are business owners ourselves. Our business operations would never be allowed to impose on someone else's rights to safety, enjoyment of property and privacy for all the right reasons. The same common-sense restrictions should exist with small private air park businesses.

# 2) Re-consider Interjurisdictional Immunity

While we appreciate that in the case of airports that are of national interest and importance the Federal government is required to be the governing body and Interjurisdictional Immunity afforded, we don't understand why small privately owned recreational air parks of zero national and economic importance are also afforded the same protections/privilege. We understand the regulatory end of it, but we just don't understand the immunity aspect. What has been witnessed in a number of jurisdictions, for example Burlington, is that these air parks use this immunity to insulate themselves from local, regional and provincial laws to the detriment of those levels of government and their tax payers. Providing PRIVATE enterprises this level of immunity from governance of other levels of government is fraught with problems as has been discussed here already with the Burlington air park case and our own personal experiences with Grimsby air park.

In this particular case, Durante Properties can operate with impunity claiming activities on the property are aviation related. As was discovered in the Burlington Air Park case the dumping of fill that occurred on that property ultimately had more to do with tipping fees than it did with air park expansion. According to court documents Rossi the owner of the Burlington Air Park netted \$855,000 for this abuse.

Additionally, we find it disturbing that a property owner can apply to have their property licensed as an airport and there is nothing the local, regional and provincial governments, or neighbours for that matter, can do about it even if the use as an airport contravenes local land use rules. We find it disturbing that PRIVATE air parks can with immunity build, alter the land, contravene noise and nuisance laws contrary to all levels of government policy that is put in place for others. There is something wrong with that.

We respectfully request that in the case of small privately owned airports such as the one in Grimsby, Interjurisdictional immunity be re-considered such that immunity to *change of use*, local building, noise and land management policy are no longer provided for.

# **3)** Restrict Air Traffic at Grimsby air park

Lastly, we respectfully request, if the above two recommendations can not for some reason be accommodated, that flight activity at this air park be heavily restricted, given the *change of use* the NEW operation represents, to that which it was while operating under the previous owners (520 per year) and the training activity halted.

As mentioned earlier we are being exposed to planes barnstorming our homes and properties every 4-5 minutes for hours on some days. This is surely something that no Tax Payer should be expected to endure to support the operation of a PRIVATELY owned for profit business that is in this case largely recreational, of ZERO economic benefit to all levels of government and is of ZERO national interest.

# TAX PAYER IMPACT STATEMENTS

# Branko Kuruc 219 Woolverton Rd. Grimsby

The increased traffic represents safety and noise issues. This air park should be re-located.

# Glen&Kathy Worstencroft 3425 South Grimsby Rd. 11 Grassie.

I am very concerned. The type of airport they are changing to, should not be in a residential area. I want to help stop it.

Yes, I am in west Lincoln, just down road 12 on the opposite side of Mud from you.

This planes pass directly over my house, last on the left before the train tracks.

They pass right over at a very low altitude. It is a scary feeling knowing that some of these pilots are in training! I do feel unsafe.

As far as enjoyment of property goes? It's gone way downhill. Can't even enjoy an outdoor BBQ with friends because of the noise!

And regarding privacy, yes I feel like I'm being watched whenever they fly over whether I'm outside doing yard work, or practicing my golf swing.

It's becoming more and more stressful as time goes on.

I've made numerous calls to the town of Grimsby bylaw enforcement officer to see if the airport must be breaking some kind of noise laws. Just called yesterday and left a message, waiting to hear back. And one more thing. What about the negative effect all this is having on the resale value of our homes?! It must be devaluing, who wants to buy a house that's in the path of runways of a busy airport? I'm mad as hell about it. Sorry, I think it's even having an affect on my mental health as well.

# Rick and Michelle Nordeman, 237 Inglehart Road, Grimsby

Michelle and I have lived at 237 Inglehart Road for 3 years and the air traffic has increased significantly over that time. Many of the planes from the Grimsby air park are flying directly over our homes at very low altitudes which makes us feel unsafe and like we are being watched. Many are also extremely loud to the point that we can't even hear each other speak. When training, the same plane takes off and lands repeatedly every 4-5 minutes making it very difficult to enjoy our backyards. Please, something needs to be done to address these concerns

# Max, Linda, and Leah Smith. 7876 Mud Street E. Grassie, ON.

We are very concerned. We have been dealing with these people since last August 2020. You have 100% of our support.

We lived here for 20 years across from the airport and never had any issues with the airport until the new owners moved into our community and took over. They show their ignorance daily.

We have been harassed and bullied, especially when putting in a complaint into the Grimsby By-Law Officer several times within the last 14 months, and didn't get any response back. They then changed their flight path to over our house. People are afraid to put a complaint in because they are afraid they will be harassed.

This airport has caused nothing but trouble. It has caused much anxiety, stress, and physical/mental health issues.

My husband has been diagnosed by the Doctor with PTSD which occured at the beginning of all of this last August. We have to wear double hearing protection due to the noise, there are vibrations inside our home when they fly over, and we are worried about the health effects this is causing. This airport needs to be shut down so we all can enjoy our properties once again.

Thank God, for our Mayor, Dave Bylsma for being 100% with us, he has been supporting us since last August 2020.

Thank you,

# John Taylor, Marie Taylor Kristine Taylor John Michael Taylor Katherine Taylor 3531 South Grimsby Road 12 Grassie

I am concerned about the issues at the air park. The noise from some of the planes is awful during take offs, particularly when they simply go up turn around land and take off again, sometimes as many as 10 – 12 times in a row, basically every 5 minutes, you cannot sit outside at times because of them! Another

concern is the height of the planes. I personally have seen the planes below 100 feet crossing over the houses on South Grimsby Road 12. Just this week I noticed a plane crossing over my back yard below 100 feet and that plane had to pull up to miss the houses on Mud Street. Something must be done for the safety of the residents trying to live a quiet peaceful life without what I can only assume is harassment by these individuals as the disturbances have escalated since the first complaints.

# Mary and Kyle Newton 8010 Mud Street, Grassie On LOR 1M0

The planes are coming in to land extremely low. I drive school bus and have noticed how low the planes are flying in. I was on my way home from my bus route the other morning and had a plane come in for a landing. I was surprised as to how low the plane was on approach. A little unnerving to say the least. I too have had my home "barn stormed". The event that stands out is an evening I was up at around 2-2:30 in the morning. There was a plan looping around my house for what seemed like an hour. I drive school bus and need to have a good nights sleep since I'm up at 5:30am to get ready for work. I believe this happened during the spring or early summer of 2020. I was livid! I do have a hard enough time sleeping now I have to worry about some pilot practicing manoeuvres the wee hours of the morning over my home. Glad the drag racing was mentioned. I couldn't enjoy a beautiful Sunday. Made Mud Street even more dangerous to walk on while the cars attending the event had no consideration to the residents and used the street to warm up. I too called Grimsby town hall and complained. Last I heard the bylaw officer was looking into it. We built our dream home here 22 years ago. We love there area for the peace and quiet and didn't mind the small quite airport and the occasional freight train. We didn't sign up for what is going on with the airport now. We pay too much in property taxes to put up with this type of "poor neighbour". I'm sure the owners of the airport wouldn't put up with what we are enduring as home owners. Thank you for what you are doing! Sincerely, Mary Newton

# Lisa Blythe. 3568 South Grimsby Rd. 12

Hi my name is Lisa Blythe I live at 3568 South Grimsby Rd. 12

I'm in 100% agreement to stop the airport from doing anything more than what the small Grassie air park did.

I'm the 8th Generation to live in Grassie, Grew up on the family fruit farm. Lived in the same place for the last 52 years and was here long before any airport went in.

The differences between the two airstrips are the following:

Old Grimsby air park

3-4 planes during the week day

6 or so maybe on the weekend

Planes would follow a flight plan and NOT go over the residential houses.

Small planes, small engines, small sound.

NEW Grimsby Regional Airport

25 plus planes during the week day

Extremely busy on the weekends probably 75 plus planes landing and taking off continuously Start flying as early as 7:00 am and well past dark.

Larger planes, bigger engines, extremely loud sounding engines

Planes constantly taking off, circling landing, taking off, circling landing.

Can't enjoy the back yard, planes low flying over our house

When the louder engine planes take off We can't talk to someone that's standing right beside you. It's terrible and extremely frustrating.

Now they started allowing exotic, modified, fast, loud cars to race on Sunday afternoons doing 1/4 mile times.

This airport is in the Hamlet of Grassie and should not be allowed or located in a residential area. Way back when the airport was much smaller and should never have been allowed to grow into what it is today. There were many of us here that were here before.

# Mike and Susanna Ferreri, 233 Inglehart Road, Grimsby, Ontario

I am very concerned about safety and noise, and lack of peacefulness around my area. It is very disturbing and disruptive to our quality of life. There are a lot of big birds like turkey vultures in this area. I have seen near misses.

It also is agitating my pets and livestock waking them up when ever they fly by so low and loud and the noise is unbelievable for such small planes.

I am kilometers away and instead of keeping out over fields fly over my home at less than 100'. Almost like they are doing it on purpose.

The new owner is not helpful.

# Jamie Campbell. 278 Allen Rd, Grimsby

I agree totally this unused airport has now become a hazard and nuisance, we can not sit out on a weekend and have a conversation with out having to wait for the noisy plane to pass only to return 15 minutes later. These planes now fly right over our home and property, when the airport was open previously (several years ago), the planes which were not frequent flew over the bush, not our heads! Thank you for taking this initiative.

#### Shelly Penny, 120 Elm Tree Rd W, Grimsby L3M 4E7

We, Jeff & Shelley Penny, would like to join your petition please. We would rather not have more air traffic over our home. The low altitude these planes fly at represents a risk to our safety, our right to enjoyment of our property and our right to privacy.

#### Carmen Biljan. 210 Kemp rd West. Grimsby, Ontario

We should file a class action lawsuit against Grimsby, the Federal Government and the Grimsby Air Park. The noise level has to increased 1000 percent. They fly right over our farm at 210 Kemp rd West. The management is unresponsive to our concerns. Every time we complain it gets worse like they are penalizing us for complaining. We really need to do something ASAP Let's get started

Carmen Biljan

#### Jill and Tony Abbot, 213 Inglehart Road, Grimsby, Ontario

We are writing this letter to address our concern with the noise and air traffic from the Grimsby air park. We are concerned about our safety as the planes travel at very low altitudes and in some cases almost appear to be out of control perhaps due to wind. Winds can be very extreme in this area.

Also , when outside and attempting to relax on our back deck/garden we are subject to the frequent droning noise and shadows of low flying planes taking off and landing from this air strip. This noise continues to be a disturbance while inside the house especially when these planes choose to turn direction overtop of our dwelling. The vibration can actually be felt when inside. We will also note at this time that these flights are not specific to a certain time of day but continue morning, afternoon and evening and have also been heard well after night fall at times. Is there no rest/downtime for these flights?

Although we respect the fact that people enjoy their flying, it should not be detrimental to our safety and the enjoyment of our own personal property. Our hope is that you as mayor will take the lead as requested to see that this situation is rectified and represent the concerns of all of us tax payers who deserve better.

#### Scott Phillips, 3557 South Grimsby Road 12, Grassie, Ontario, L0R1M0

This air park never used to be a problem. Now it has become a big problem and safety concern.

# Andy Gould and Crystal Angers, 218 Inglehart Road, Grimsby

MAKE IT STOP! WE ARE TAX PAYERS AND HAVE RIGHTS!

# Mike and Nattie Rehner, 270 Inglehart Road, Grimsby

We are against the expansion of the local airport. The increased air traffic presents increased safety risk given the extremely low altitudes and results in noise, pollution, and privacy concerns. Their are no benefits of this expansion to our neighbours and local community, only detriments. This needs to be stopped. Mike and Natty Rehner

#### Tony and Sandy Viveros, 205 Inglehart Road, Grimsby, Ontario

Please know that we are extremely concerned about the air traffic generated by the new owners of the Grimsby Air Park.

I have lived in my home since 1998 and the problem has been getting worse since the purchase. It is obvious that if an incident like a bird strike occurred they would have no chance to recover. Please know migratory birds are common in this area. We have witnessed impacts.

At any rate they should have more respect for our safety and privacy. There are a lot of fields they can fly over if need be. Actually it would be better for all concerned if this air park did not exist. It doesn't belong here and would be better suited farther south on a bigger property away from homes.

There are days that they start about 6 a.m., carry on all day at about 5 minute intervals and are so low to the houses, it is unnerving. So low that we can almost see the pilot. We can feel vibrations in our home which is unacceptable.

I hope that this situation can be resolved soon.

# Greg and Rita Middleton, 241 Inglehart Road, Grimsby

The new owners of this air park have ZERO regard for their neighbours. If the pilots and management were concerned about safety they wouldn't fly directly over homes that are km's away at less than 100'. This air park needs to be re-located where it won't put people and property at risk. Where it won't have to depend on property they don't own to attain a safe flight altitude. It has no business operating in this built-up area. This problem will not go away and will only get worse when more development inevitably occurs here.

# Tino Cipans, 179 Inglehart Road, Grimsby

This air park should never have been allowed in the first place. Ruby Wilcox hated it especially when they chopped her trees down after she told them no. Two planes have crashed their already.

# Joe Deluca – President– Gizio Club, 288 Kemp Road, Grimsby

I own/run a business and have made significant investment in this community in a manner that results in significant municipal taxes and provincial/federal taxes. I employ people in this area. I have to jump through hoops to plant trees and install a community soccer field, yet this privately owned company is allowed to ruin our business and do whatever it wants. How am I supposed to host a wedding with noisy planes flying over our property in a way that is dangerous and inconsiderate. These recreational pilots are ruining this area and this air park needs to be re-located.

# Carleigh & Jordan Hochheimer, 442 Mud St West, Grassie LOR 1M0

We are concerned with the increased traffic, increased noise, and not only the safety of us but of our two small children. Not only are the planes an issue flying directly above our house CONSTANTLY, but a few weeks ago they had a drag racing competition there and the increase in traffic was insane. We had cars flying down our road WAY above the speed limit with zero concern or regard to anyone or anything. How am we supposed to feel safe raising our family when the owner doesn't care about anyones safety? This is not ok and these issues need to be corrected.

# Robert and Lacy Stull 3577 S. Grimsby Road 12, Grassie

Unsafe and noisy aircraft originating from this air park.

# Walter Vanderholk, 489 Allen Road, Grassie, Ontario

Unsafe and noisy aircraft originating from this air park.

# Maria Kuiper, 198 Mud Street, Grimsby, Ontario

Unsafe and noise all nights. Causing me migraines.

# Misaru Suzuki 3556 South Grimsby Road 12, Grassie, Ontario

We are concerned about our safety, noise and quality of life.

# Shawn Comeau, 3588 S. Grimsby Road 12. Grassie, Ontario

I have witnessed planes flying so low I thought it was going to hit Max Smiths house. This has happened far more than once. It looked like they were doing it on purpose.

#### Chris Moffat, Grassie Road

Even at some distance from this air park these planes fly extremely low often banking over our barns and livestock causing them grief. We are concerned for our safety, the well being of our livestock and the peace that typically comes from living in the country. My family's home has been here a lot longer than this air park ever was!

Here is a sample of what we have to deal with in terms of traffic. Imagine your home barnstormed continuously every few minutes for hours on end!

	* * * * *			-
	· · · · ·		and a state of the	1 1 1 1 1 1 1
12. 4.1		Quer House	Airpor	+2
	Low Flyevers Directly	Uter cross	945 616	16
2021	Dec. 23 7.58 AM - plane	Thursday.	07	
	8:45 AM - plane			6 X )
	8151 AM			6
	9:04 AM			6
	9:11 Am			6
	9:18 AM		E. Fa	
	9:25 AM.	Carribian	Fightans	6
	9:31 AM.	Lesson		6
·	9:38 AM	Lerson		6
	9:58 AM -			-6-
	10:04 AM			6
	10:14 AM			E X
	10:28 AM			6
	10:35 An			6
	10:42 AM			6
	10:50 AM.			C
	10:57 "			· · ·
	11:21			
	11:45			-
	11:54			· ·
	12:55 P.M.			2 .
	1:01 PM			e 1 '
	1:04 PM			e
	3:04 PM			C
11	3:17 PM			C
	3:22			0
	3:27 PM			
	3:38			
	3143 PM.			all a
	3:49 3.46			-
	257			et /
	3:51		0	CLU C
	2.21			
Vv				
S			The second second	
0'8'8'8'8'8'8'		ZVV		